No. 312

The Christian News-Letter

Edited by KATHLEEN BLISS

26th May, 1948

NEWS-LETTER

WORLD FOOD POLICY

THE EASTERN MOOD

OWNERSHIP FOR ALL

SUPPLEMENT

MR. MURRY ON THE FREE SOCIETY—II

BY

J. H. OLDHAM

SIR JOHN BOYD ORR, whose two years as Director-General of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations have given him a knowledge of the world food situation which no man has previously had an opportunity to acquire, has launched a campaign to convince a large public that unless swift action is taken world famine is not only a possibility, but a certainty. The facts which he wants people to understand can be speedily summarized. First, the amount of virgin soil left in the world which might be used for the production of food is very small: roughly speaking, mankind has to produce the food it needs from the land already under cultivation. Secondly, methods of cultivation employed have reduced, and are still reducing, the fertility of the soil which can be quickly destroyed and only very slowly and expensively restored. Lastly, the total population of the world is steadily increasing. The main gist of Sir John's plea is that governments and peoples alike should see that famine is as great a danger as war and divert some of the resources now devoted to defence to large plans for producing more food, before disaster comes. Many people in this country have not fully grasped the fact that Sir John is not just talking about the Balkan peasantry or half-fed Asiatics: he means also ourselves in this crowded island. The relief afforded by American aid has obscured the true

picture of a Britain struggling to buy food in a world of hard bargains. There has been so much talk about a future decline of population in Britain (which is pure speculation) that the plain fact that Britain's population increased by 5 per cent between 1937 and 1947 is scarcely realized.

With all that Sir John says about the necessity for conserving and increasing the fertility of the soil and giving greater encouragement to primary producers than has been customary since the Industrial Revolution, few Christians will disagree. Indeed, if they had taken the doctrine of creation more seriously, they might have protested long ago against the wholesale exploitation of the earth which has been going on in the name of cheap food. The ancient festival of Rogationtide, which used to be the chief agricultural festival of the Christian year, sought the blessing of God on the soil, the springing crops and the work of the farmer. Its decline during the period of British industrial prosperity and its replacement in Christian practice by the Harvest Festival, a new-comer to the Church's year, is a far more eloquent comment on the drift of Christian opinion than any extracts from Christian writers, preachers or thinkers. The change clearly shows that under the impact of a machine age the interest of Christian men moved from the processes of agriculture to its fruits. There has been some reversal of sentiment now: the Christian doctrine of creation is coming to the fore again in Christian thinking, with a reassertion both of man's dependence upon the natural resources of the earth for his very existence and of his responsibility under God for using them aright. A practical example of this new emphasis can be seen in the changing policy of nearly all Christian missions, which are appointing skilled agriculturalists and putting an altogether new emphasis on preserving rural communities.

World events are compelling men to think again about the dependence of human life on the soil and new opportunities open up for making Christian truth relevant to men's felt needs. But many Christians who see these possibilities too easily regard the new emphasis on agriculture as a way of escaping from some of the tough problems posed by industry. The " nature " to which men seem

to be " returning " is a nature radically modified by all the action upon it of man, including technical and scientific man. When Sir John Boyd Orr speaks of a great development of food production he assumes as essential to that policy cheap transport, a great development of scientific research and the use of industrial resources for producing agricultural machinery, buildings and equipment. While it is constantly and incontrovertibly stated that industry, whether it likes it or not, is dependent upon the agriculturalist, who grows the food for industrial workers, and produces, jointly with the miner (using that term in its widest sense) most of the raw materials of industry, it is also true that the kind of agricultural development needed to avert the fearful catastrophe for mankind, which Sir John so clearly sees, *depends upon scientists and industrialists delivering the goods.*

The implications of this fact for Christian thinking are large. The greatest successes of the Gospel in modern days have been won in areas untouched by industrial development, among the rural populations of India, China, and Africa. With the typical man of the day, the technical man, the Church makes very slow progress. The farmer, however up to date, will never be exactly the same type of person as the machine-tool maker, for his materials and circumstances of work are, and will remain, different. But it cannot be doubted that many of the mental attitudes and attributes of the technical man are entering into the make-up of agriculturalists, and it is men of this temperament who will set the direction and the pace in the agriculture of the future, as they have done in Russia. If one is tempted to reflect that there is little likelihood of turning any of the world's primary producers into technically-minded men, one might perhaps remember that James Watt moved from Glasgow to Birmingham and started the building of steam engines there, " because ", he said, " the Scots are incapable of becoming engineers " !

Sir John Boyd Orr also made reference to the staggering growth of world population and to its pressure on world food supplies. The very sketchiest acquaintance with history will tell anybody that great movements of population nearly always have their origin in the search for food, and

that such movements when they gain momentum cannot be contained. There is a real struggle behind the Food and Agricultural Organization frustrating its purposes, between those who want to raise the standard of living of ill-nourished people and those who see in such action a threat to the way of life of highly civilized communities in which population tends to be static or to decline. Those who take the latter point of view point to the undoubted fact that the first effect of even a slight improvement in nutrition among people on the border-line of famine is a marked increase in births, which quickly tends to restore near-famine conditions. On the opposite side, those who want to see the Food and Agricultural Organization use its resources to decrease the disparity between the countries of the world where food supplies are plentiful and those where they are scanty claim that they are not acting on sentiment only, but on the experience of Europe and America that the surest road to a stabilized population is a high standard of living.

The discussion of population statistics and policies is full of a hundred pitfalls. Malthus in his own day seemed incontrovertible: his gloomy prognostications were denied by events which he could not have foreseen, but now his darkest prophecies come to the fore again, this time on a world scale. Present trends seem to indicate continuing large increases in world population and very slight increases in food. The likely places of large increases of population are in the East, but this is just the part of the world where sweeping changes in outlook and attitude are taking place, not only among leaders but among ever-widening circles of great populations. Population statistics can take no cognizance of such changes, the effects of which are utterly unpredictable. We still assume too much that initiatives belong to the West and that wisdom was born with us and will die with us, and this causes us to give a prophetic sanctity to global population and food statistics which we compile, while the real governing forces of the future may be active in the East rather than in the West.

Our concern is primarily with our own population and our own food resources. The Royal Commission on Popula-

tion will produce all the relevant facts about population which can be found for this country: meanwhile P.E.P. has published a book on population policy in Great Britain,[1] and devoted a recent Broadsheet [2] to its main points. It wisely remarks that "population policy is, in its widest sense, almost synonymous with policy in general". This reveals one of the dangers of large talk about planning either the size or the quality of a population: the would-be planner finds himself driven to put a planning hand on almost every activity in society. The decision whether or not to have children, and how many and when is the most intimate and personal decision any man or woman can make. Attempts to influence it by propaganda in the name of some supposed public good are fiercely and rightly opposed as an attack on essential human freedom. But many parents are not genuinely free to choose: large families are too expensive, houses are rare and dear, and a dozen other social and economic factors make the decision between two and six children not a choice at all. It is in this field that a population policy, or rather a population emphasis in all policy is needed.

THE EASTERN MOOD

The Rev. Norman Goodall, Secretary of the International Missionary Council, broadcast after a prolonged visit to the Far East on the prevailing mood there as he saw it. What he said links with the previous paragraphs. Here is part of what he said;—

"In many parts of the world men are thoroughly excited by the prospect before them. For them the outlook isn't at all gloomy: it is bright. I've felt this very powerfully lately as I've travelled in India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, Malaya. Four of these lands have celebrated Independence Days within the last six to nine months. In the fifth, important constitutional changes are in process. We misread the world situation to-day if we miss the note of confidence, the sense of being alive at a great time, which is resounding through these lands. We may sense dangers to

[1] *Population Policy in Great Britain.* Political and Economic Planning. 15s.

[2] *Planning,* April 30, 1948, Political and Economic Planning, 16 Queen Anne's Gate, London, S.W. 1.

which people in the orient seem unwisely indifferent, but that 's not the main story.

" What lies behind all this ? The feeling is partly racial. It is the self-conscious strength of the orient feeling its vigour over against the declining authority of the West. I personally think that a day will come when the East will acknowledge its debt to the West more readily. But, not surprisingly, this isn't the natural assumption of the new nation-builders. It is their own history, their own cultural and spiritual inheritance which dominates their thought. They feel free to make their own contribution to contemporary history. They feel capable of making it.

" Bound up with this strong racial self-consciousness there is also an exhilarating sense of liberation. To understand the emotional meaning of these Independence Days, we need somehow to think ourselves into a mood which hasn't been very natural to us lately. When did you last sing, ' Rule, Britannia ' ? If you could imagine a shout like that becoming a quite natural explosion, sending a shiver down your spine, you would know what Independence Days have been meaning in the East during the last few months. Much of this feeling assumes that the political revolutions now altering the relations between East and West are emancipating the under-privileged. I am sure that the appeal of Communism in countries like India and Burma and Ceylon (and its appeal is spreading) has far more to do with its claim to liberate the under-privileged than to any deliberate ' Vote for Russia ', as over against America. I would say that this note very much has its echo in the temper of the Churches. In fact, I could claim that not merely an echo, but an original note of jubilation is to be heard in these Churches. Christianity has come to all these lands as liberating news, and it has provided the faith in which men have realized that they are born to conquer and not to be frustrated—yes, even in such a world as this. But Christians in the East are not turning their backs on the West. For them, over against national and racial self-consciousness, there is the corrective of a sense of world-unity, based on realities deeper than any difference between East and West."

OWNERSHIP FOR ALL

A reader of the News-Letter who is an active member of the Liberal Party sends us the following note. He was himself a member of the committee whose action he describes :—

" The News-Letter has so often discussed the Christian action in politics that some of its readers may be interested in the *Ownership for All* policy that was adopted by the Liberal Party in the April Assembly at Blackpool.[1] Some of the group framing the policy were readers of the News-Letter and the group itself was helped during its work by the valuable Supplements on ' Responsibility in the Economic System '.[2]

" The key idea of the policy is that shareholders ought not to be regarded as the sole owners of an industrial concern. The policy itself aims at establishing the ownership of industrial concerns jointly by shareholders, managers, and workers and it provides for compulsory profit-sharing and the election of workers' representatives to all boards of directors.

" The group has been careful not to call this ' a Christian policy ', and readers of the News-Letter will doubtless agree that they were right, but the moving spirits in the policy's making were Christians, and certainly the philosophy behind the group was consciously Christian.

" The fundamental assumption was that men have some right of property in what they make, because something of themselves has gone into the making of it. This is the traditional Thomist view reflected in Locke. The group held that workers have a natural right of property in their place of work, in the tools they use and in the product of their hands. One of the effects of the Industrial Revolution had been to destroy that right for the ordinary worker. In 1750 under the domestic system of manufacture great numbers of industrial workers did in fact own their place of

[1] The resolution on *Ownership for All* is to be found on pages 6-8 of *Liberal Policy*, 1948, published by the Liberal Party, 22 Gayfere Street, S.W. 1. Price 6d.

[2] C.N-L. Supplements, Nos. 190, 204, 242.

work, their tools and their product. Fifty years later almost all were wage-earners in someone else's factory.

" This destruction of a natural right, the Liberal group thought, lay behind the industrial dissensions of the nineteenth century, and accounted in part for the rise of the Labour movement. But the group considered that the public ownership of vast industries proposed by political Socialism could not restore this lost right or in any way compensate for the earlier loss of ownership in a more intimate sphere, the place where a man worked.

" In devising the particular form of associational ownership described in their resolution the Liberal group attempted to avoid the main dangers of *a priori* political policies. Its aim was to restore a natural right in a form applicable to modern industry, not to re-shape modern industry. The devices used to apply the principle of associational ownership—profit-sharing and directorial representation—had at least the merit of having been actually employed with some success in a good number of firms in this country. It is worth noting here that the Conservative Party, in its 'Industrial Charter', has also shown interest in such a policy, the main difference being that the Liberals are committed to legislation. Each industrial firm would be required to work out its scheme for co-ownership, in conformity with the general lines laid down, and submit it to a specially constituted commission.

" Most of the members of the group were too closely involved in industry as managing directors, accountants, company directors or managerial executives to imagine that it would be easy to cover the varying field of industry with any one set of principles, however general. Yet they have great confidence in their main idea, and the scheme itself can grow as it is further worked upon and criticized. What they have tried to do is to bring traditional Christian thinking on the nature and needs of man to bear on the modern industrial scene, and there has been some tactical success in gaining party support for the policy."

Kathleen Bliss

MR. MURRY ON THE FREE SOCIETY—II

DEAR EDITOR,

I question whether the C.N-L. has ever published anything that probes more deeply the central issues confronting modern society than the letter from Professor Donald MacKinnon four weeks ago. I mean by this the whole dialectic, including equally the main thesis of Murry's book and the grounds on which MacKinnon criticizes it. I do not wish to controvert anything that MacKinnon has said, nor do I expect that he will want to quarrel seriously with what I shall say. But he was unable, in the space at his disposal, to bring out sufficiently Murry's side of the dialectic; and I should like to be allowed to state what I believe to be the core of what Murry is contending for.

The discussion of Murry's book has been so much focused on what he says about war, that I must define my position on that question before dealing with the main subject of this letter. I am one of those who believe that the dilemma with which war confronts us is in the present state of society irresolvable. The Report of the Anglican Commission [1] set up by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to consider the Report of the Commission of the British Council of Churches on *The Era of Atomic Power* (of which you and MacKinnon and I were members) criticize us for calling it irresolvable. But while the new report contains much fresh material that helps to illuminate the moral problem, it does not overcome the fundamental contradiction. It is true that " the soul seeks peace and certitude ", but there are situations in which it must find peace without the certitude. Every apparent escape from the dilemma is by minimizing the sharpness of one of its horns.

No one who knows Murry will suppose that he is really advocating war with Russia. If there are passages in his book that convey that impression, it is because he is too honest a thinker not to face the consequences of a position to which he

[1] *The Church and the Atom.* Press and Publications Board, Church House, Dean's Yard, S.W. 1. 4s.

commits himself. To make sure that he is really facing them he is apt at times to state them in an extreme form. If in the threat to the values of the free society the very being of man is at stake, then there is something to be defended at all costs—even (which God forbid) at the cost of war. That I believe is the essence of what Murry wants to say. He seems to me also to be wholly right in his insistence that in the political sphere the attempt to *avoid* war may be the surest means of precipitating it.

But I have no confidence that war, even as a last resort, can serve the cause of the free society. There may be situations in which there is nothing to be done but to resist by force those who are seeking to impose a false and evil way of life. But ideas have a life of their own. The defeat of Russia in war would afford no guarantee that the communist ideology would not survive to spread contagion in wider fields ; nor that out of the inhumanity and degradation of modern war some new monstrous idolatry might not be born to enslave men's minds.

Murry is right in holding that there is no hope for the free society or for humanity unless we get rid of war. The Lilienthal Report, and the Baruch proposals based on it, seemed to me an act of statesmanship of the highest order—a bright ray of light in the darkness of the post-war world. The Russian rejection of them, which we learned a fortnight ago was final, appears to me a calamity. But to fight a war to ensure the adoption of the proposal is another matter. Can an untried and untested experiment in international organization evoke from men the ultimate sacrifice ? A war in defence of the liberties of the British Commonwealth of Nations, which have through centuries struck deep roots in the affections and habits of the people and are a solid reality, makes some sort of sense. But the free society of nations is something in the air, a dream. It has still to be created. A war which aroused new and more terrible fears, let loose the wildest passions, and brought about unforeseeable new alignments, so far from making the task of creating the free society easier and more certain, might easily make it impossible for generations to come.

The more I try to get at the heart of Murry's thinking, the clearer it seems to me that the real enemy that he is fighting is

not so much Communism as power—naked, unrestrained, irresponsible power. If that is true, the dividing line between the ambitions of irresponsible power and Murry's ideal of the free society does not coincide with the division between Russia and the western democracies. There may be wide differences in practice in different countries and at different periods in the extent to which restraints are set on the exercise of power, and the power of a totalitarian state may become a menace which can be opposed only by force. But things are seen in a different perspective if we realize that the real enemy is unbridled power, and that the enemy is ubiquitous and assumes constantly changing shapes.

THE MEANING OF THE FREE SOCIETY

Having stated these differences, I come to what seems to me the real importance of Murry's book. And here, perhaps, the first step is to get rid of certain misconceptions that are suggested to some minds by the name which Murry has given to what he is writing about. The trouble in talking about a free society is that the term "free" has become debased. It can be given meanings sharply opposed to one another. It may mean, and in the mouths of many people does mean, freedom to maintain privilege. For this reason, when you speak of a free society, people are apt to take sides before you can explain what you intend. You may have aroused an invincible prejudice. The last thing Murry wants to defend is unjust privilege; it is, in his view, a necessary condition of the free society that it should make economic equality its goal. What he means by the free society is a society in which a man is able to obey his conscience, to engage with others in a common search for truth, and to live in real love and charity with his neighbours. It is in these things that man's humanity consists and it is in answer to a threat to their survival that Murry has written his book.

An important clue to Murry's thinking is the intensity of his conviction that Christianity is something to be lived. That is a truth which no Christian will question. But there are different ways of knowing it. Murry knows it "on his pulses". A faith that cannot be lived has no meaning for him. That may seem

a platitude. But platitudes may become tremendously alive when they are filled with a fresh content and allowed to possess the whole being.

THE NATURE OF MODERN SOCIETY

What makes Murry's book significant is the combination of the conviction that the Christian faith is something to be lived with a penetrating insight into the kind of society in which it has to be lived to-day. He sees more clearly than most of his contemporaries where modern society is tending. As a result of the growth of a technical society, and the accompanying large-scale organization, man has become in a quite new degree socialized. The area of the decisions which it is open to the individual to make on his sole responsibility is progressively diminished, while the range of actions which are determined either by authority or by collective decisions, in which he has only a minor voice is steadily extended. This change affects different persons according to their station and function in society in varying degrees. But it is the *direction* that matters.

The process is taking place in what are called the free societies no less than in those which are totalitarian. "What those two modes of existence have in common is as significant as their opposition. In them both society dominates the individual; in both the preponderant reality of the individual—his centre of gravity, so to speak—is shifted from himself to the society to which he belongs."

Murry perceives the vital meaning of this change. In proportion as the life of the individual as expressed in his daily actions, is determined by the collective decisions of society, or of groups within society, that life can have a moral quality only if moral purpose permeates society as a whole. It is not necessary that society should be completely moral, but the leaven of moral purpose must be at work in it and the individual must have real, even if limited, opportunity of increasing that leaven. If these conditions are not fulfilled, the greater part of what the individual *does*, as distinct from what he thinks, or aspires after, ceases to have any Christian quality. Consequently,

to create and preserve the conditions in which men will have the largest possible share in determining the moral purposes of society is of vital importance.

It is in the context of this view of the nature of modern society that Murry's renunciation of pacifism is to be understood. It is not a capricious choice, but the compulsion of the inner logic of his thinking when exposed to the crucial test of experience. He made the pacifist decision and tried to live by it. He became one of the outstanding moral and intellectual leaders of the pacifist movement. Increasingly he found the position spiritually intolerable. He could not live as a pacifist in a society at war without sacrificing his integrity. His moral being was torn in two, and he found one half of himself outraging the other half. The two chapters which describe this experience, which was shared by many younger pacifists, deserve careful study. I agree with the argument, and for this reason, in spite of what I have written earlier, I cannot adopt the pacifist attitude in politics.

THE FREE SOCIETY AND THE CHURCH

Murry's realization of the increasing integration of modern society is the explanation also of his provocative statement that the free society is to-day a truer and fuller realization of the body of Christ than the institutional Churches. It is on this point that MacKinnon most decidedly joins issue with him. I am with MacKinnon in this matter. But I am equally convinced that, unless the Churches give heed to Murry's side of the dialectic, they will count for very little in contemporary society.

If Christianity is something to be lived, it is in the activities of secular society that it has to be lived. It is there that the real tests are encountered. Unless it is possible to live the Christian life of love within those secular activities, the power impulses of human nature are left to operate unchecked and the end is the totalitarian state. It is because Murry sees this so clearly that he is impatient with those who think that Christianity can somehow survive in the Church, whatever happens to society.

"If the free society should perish, the God of conscience will have no society of men in which to live. I cannot, as some do,

console myself with the thought that there will remain God's own society, the eternal Christian Church. I do not believe that that is a *real* thought; it is only an escape from thinking."

The idea that, no matter how far society proceeds in the totalitarian direction in which it is tending, Christians can maintain a Christian existence apart from it is a deception. We are deceived by it because in the society we know this still looks as though it might be possible. In this country we are still living on the capital of the Christian tradition; the question is what will happen if modern society consciously repudiates that faith. MacKinnon's instances of the independent life of the Church in societies like the Spain of the Inquisition or in India to-day do not meet Murry's point. Nor is it relevant to point to the early days of Christianity under the Roman Empire. What Murry is trying to awaken us to is the *trend* of things. Our scientific and technical civilization is a new fact in human history. It is bringing about a new mode of human existence. There is no reason why man should become enslaved to the "second nature" which his discoveries and inventions have brought into existence. But we can surmount the danger, only if we arouse ourselves in time. If a really fundamental change is in process, it is as foolish to buoy ourselves up by pointing to conditions in the past or to surviving areas of freedom in the present, as to claim that unsubmerged patches of land are evidence that the tide is not advancing.

FAITH AND THE POLITICAL ARENA

Disagreement with Murry on particular points ought not to blind us to the fact that he is saying in this book something of crucial importance. His insistence that a living faith must find *political* expression is the word which our times need.[1]

I do not think that the Churches, speaking generally, are really alive to what Murry is driving at. If they were fully aware of what is at stake they would not be content, as they in the main are, to proclaim their message and leave to their individual

[1] The large question remains, of course, *what* is political decision. A decision to enter a contemplative order might be a political decision—more deeply political than joining a political party. Practical choices may widely diverge. The vital matter is real engagement with the actual life of society.

members the difficult task of finding out how it can be lived in relation to the demands and pressures of the secular life. They would see that modern society has moved so far away from an understanding of the Christian Gospel that only by a direct and specific concern with the concrete problems which meet Christians in their daily work can the gulf be bridged. Only by this means can religion be re-united with life.

THE MEANING OF HISTORY

We may admit that Murry at times makes things appear simpler than they are; that he makes too little allowance for the way in which even the sharpest oppositions may even themselves out in practical life; that he tends to idealize the free societies, as they actually exist; that he does not always discriminate sufficiently between Communism and communists; that he takes too little account of the seamy side of politics, and of the inevitable compromises that it demands; that he does not distinguish sufficiently clearly between the limited freedom that is possible at the political level and the freedom of the Kingdom of God. On all these matters there is a wide field for fruitful debate. But none of these qualifications detract from the fact that Murry has seen with unusual clarity that the historical process confronts men to-day with a fateful and inescapable choice; that in the choice between a surrender to power and a commitment to love the whole being of man is involved; that the issue has to be decided in the political sphere; that the greatness of what is at stake may give immeasurable meaning even to small achievements in that sphere and to the institutional embodiments of justice and tolerance; and that on the preservation of political freedom, where it has been won, and in particular on the power of the people to control and dismiss their rulers, so that (in Mr. Churchill's phrase) the people own the Government and not the Government the people, everything may turn.

His book compels us to face the question whether there is any temporal future for Christianity in the kind of society that is coming into existence. He sees that it is in the total life of an increasingly integrated humanity that the struggle between power and love has to be waged. If power is triumphant, there will

be no place left for a genuinely human life. That is what Murry means when he says that if the free society, or the society of love, were to disappear, history would cease to have a meaning. He does not deny that the meaning of history is given in Christ, nor that the Cross is precisely the revelation of a meaning in the rejection of meaning—of a love that triumphs over that rejection. What he wants to assert is that that revelation was made to human minds, and that, if the free society disappears, human minds will cease to be. Man will become incapable of receiving the revelation. He will cease to know that there is another mode of existence—a way of love, of search for truth—cease to have the faculty by which he can discern it, cease to be aware of the moment when the other mode of existence irrupted into and became incarnate in man's earthly life.

It is because Murry perceives this so deeply that what he has to say in his book is the indispensable counterpart to MacKinnon's exposition of Christianity. Without the incorporation into life for which Murry is pleading the declaration of these eternal truths will be no more than " empty words—incantations dimly remembered from a distant past ". On the other hand, without the *givenness* of Christianity on which MacKinnon insists the meaning of love is reduced to human dimensions and emptied of its divine depth and power.

Ever yours,

J. H. OLDHAM.

Subscriptions—£1 ($4.00 in U.S.A. and Canada) for one year, 10s. 6d. for six months (Great Britain and Ireland only). Single copies, 10d.; reduction for quantities.

Indices—Vols. I—XII (Oct. 1939—Dec. 1947), 1s. each post free.

Folders—To hold six months' supply, 3s. each post free.

Groups—Special rates for group subscriptions may be had on application.

Bound Volumes—Vols. II—XII (May 1940—Dec. 1947) 15s. each post free, or 12s. 6d. each in sets of four or more consecutive volumes.

All communications and subscriptions should be sent to—
THE CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER, 20 BALCOMBE STREET, DORSET SQUARE, LONDON, N.W. 1

Published by the Christian Frontier Trust, Ltd., and printed in Great Britain by the Church Army Press, Cowley, Oxford.